

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated August 11, 2003, claim 1 is rejected. Claims 2-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1 and 3 are herein amended. The amendments are essentially editorial in nature and claim 3 is additionally amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-19 are in the case.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the rejections states that, "in claim1, formula 1, the moiety B' is undefined."

Applicants submit that the brackets (*i.e.*, [ ]) used in the previous Amendment to indicate the hierarchy of the definitions of the different moieties of the compound are mistaken by the Examiner as indicating the "deletion" of the bracketed phrases. In the Amendment filed May 13, 2003, Applicants did **not** intend that those bracketed phrases to be deleted from the claims. As can be seen from the Amendment, Applicants used "strikethroughs" to delete unwanted phrases and "underline" to add necessary phrases and, therefore, the bracketed phrases were not to be construed as amendments to delete the phrases.

However, Applicants acknowledge the confusing situation created by the use of brackets and parentheses. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 are herein amended to delete the brackets and parentheses, wherever confusing, using "strikethrough" marks. Further, some paragraphs in claim 1 are started in new lines so as to make the definitions clearer.

In addition, claim 1 is amended to correct a typographical error of "10,000-5000,000" to "10,000-**500,000**." Support for this amendment can be found, for example,

in original claim 1 and at page 19, line 8.

Accordingly, claim 1 now properly recites the definition of the moiety "B" and, therefore, Applicants respectfully request that claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Objection

Claims 2-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Since Applicants believe that claim 1 and 3 as amended are now in condition for allowance, all the dependent claims therefrom should be also allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the claim objection be withdrawn and all the pending claims be allowed.

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-2215. A duplicate copy of this paper is enclosed.

Dated: September 12, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Charles E. Miller

Registration No.: 24,576

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant